REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Interview held on May 18, 2006 and for indicating that the proposed amendment overcomes the art of record.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, and 15 are amended according to the Examiner's suggestion. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the above amendments and the remarks that follow are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

On page 2 the Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over U.S. Patent 5,257,387 to Richek et al (hereafter Richek) in view of U.S. Patent 5,634,072 to Allen et al (hereafter Allen). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Richek is directed to a computer implemented method and apparatus for dynamic and automatic configuration of a computer system and circuit boards including computer resource allocation conflict resolution. Allen is directed to a method and system for managing one or more coupling facilities in a data processing system. However, as agreed upon during the May 18, 2006 Interview, Richek and Allen, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "calculating an optimal distribution of the excess entitlement values to be reallocated to each active group by traversing exactly one time the list of active groups in the increasing order; and reallocating the excess entitlement values to the active groups according to the optimal distribution for each active group, wherein optimal values reallocated to the active groups are in proportion to the respective entitlement values, and wherein a total resource reallocated to each of the active groups does not exceed a maximum limit for each of the active groups," as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). Claim 1 is amended according to the Examiner's suggestion to more precisely recite the novel features of the present application.

Specifically, the present application computes an optimal distribution faster than any of the prior art methods (including Rickek and Allen) by traversing exactly one time the list of groups without having to go through the list over and over. In other words, for an N-item list, the method of claim 1 only requires N steps to complete the calculation, not 2^N steps or N^2 steps (which is required by the prior art methods). This feature is not disclosed or suggested by any prior art methods (including Richek and Allen). Since Richek and Allen, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 and 4-7 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding independent claim 8, for at least the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Rickek and Allen, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "calculates an optimal distribution of the excess entitlement values to be reallocated to each active group by traversing exactly one time the list of active groups in the increasing order; and reallocates the excess entitlement values to the active groups according to the optimal distribution for each active group, wherein optimal values reallocated to the active groups are in proportion to the respective entitlement values, and wherein a total resource reallocated to each of the active groups does not exceed a maximum limit for each of the active groups," as recited in amended claim 8 (emphasis added). Therefore, amended claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 10-14 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 8 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding independent claim 15, for at least the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Rickek and Allen, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "calculates an optimal distribution of the excess entitlement values to be reallocated to each active group by traversing exactly one time the list of active groups in the increasing order; and reallocating the excess entitlement values to the active groups according to the optimal distribution for each active group, wherein optimal values reallocated to the active groups are in proportion to active groups' respective entitlement values, and wherein a total resource reallocated to each of the active groups does not exceed a maximum limit for the groups," as recited in amended claim 15 (emphasis added). Therefore, amended claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 17-20 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 15 and for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **July 13, 2006**

Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1350 I Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739